

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11-12 and 17-18 are written in independent form.

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's grant of a telephonic interview with the Applicants' counsel, Ryan C. Carter, Esq., on March 9, 2007. In the interview, said counsel argued that the Examiner's allegation that *Wang* explicitly taught the cited portion of the "assigning" recitation in Claim 1 was vague and unclear. Said counsel further argued how it appeared that the Examiner did not examine the currently pending set of claims as amended in the Response dated May 5, 2006.

In response, the Examiner agreed with each of the foregoing arguments. The Examiner further suggested filing a Response including the foregoing arguments, in response to which the Examiner agreed to withdraw the Office Action dated November 15, 2006. The Examiner may issue a second non-final Office Action, in which case the statutory time period for response to the non-final Office Action would be restarted. In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Office Action dated November 15, 2006.

Although the merits of the present claims generally were not discussed at length in the interview, Applicants further note that the Examiner's allegation that *Wang* explicitly teaches "assigning the primitive combination to both the forward and reverse channels" is unclear and is, in fact, inapplicable to Claim 1, because this recitation mentioned by the Examiner is not recited in Claim 1. This argument was presented to the Examiner by said counsel in the interview, and the Examiner appeared to be in agreement with said counsel. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the present claims be deemed allowable, or in the alternative, that the aforementioned flaws in the Office Action are cured in a second non-final Office Action.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-10 and 13-16, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-10 and 13-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/RCC/dr